



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/216,489	12/18/1998	MANNAN A. MOHAMMED	INTL-0071-US	9624

7590

12/19/2002

TIMOTHY N TROP  
TROP PRUNER HU AND MILES  
8554 KATY FREEWAY SUITE 100  
HOUSTON, TX 77024

EXAMINER

MISLEH, JUSTIN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2612

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/216,489

Applicant(s)

MOHAMMED ET AL.

Examiner

Justin P Misleh

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 December 1998 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 9 (page 1 – line 17). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 91 (figure 12). A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
3. The drawings are objected to because reference signs 45d and 45e, as shown in figure 11, are misrepresented in the description. The misrepresentation is stated, on page 8 (lines 10 – 12), as: *a quality command 45e (to set the quality of the captured image to either poor, good or best), an action command 66 (to inform the camera 42 whether to take a still or a video image)*. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 13 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 12. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker et al.

7. For claims 1, 6, 10, and 14, Parker et al. discloses a multi-user camera control system including a plurality of personal controllers (personal locator) controlling a selected camera. The controllers are programmed with the capability to send command packets to the selected camera. Parker et al. discloses, as shown in figures 1 and 3 and as stated in columns 6 (lines 30 – 59) and 7 (lines 35 – 41) a method comprising: generating a first set of commands for an imaging device during a first time interval, the first set of commands being associated with a first task to be performed by the imaging device; generating a second set of commands for the imaging device during a second time interval that overlaps the first time interval, the second set of commands

Art Unit: 2612

being associated with a second task to be performed by the imaging device; transmitting the first set of commands to the imaging device during a third time interval; and transmitting the second set of commands to the imaging device during a fourth time interval that does not overlap the third time interval. Parker teaches a system in which a plurality of personal locators (11) are programmed, by onboard keypad (19), with the bus address of the selected camera. The selected camera's field of view variables, PAN, TILT, ZOOM, FOCUS, IRIS, etc. are adjusted from each individual personal locator using button switches (37 – 44) on the keypad. The commands associated with adjusting the selected camera's field of view are generated, are packaged, and are stored in each individual personal locator by the routine as shown in flowchart 2 (figure 7).

When a particular user wants to display their stored field of view command packet, the MY TURN button (41) on the keypad of their personal locator is pressed and the command packet is transmitted to the camera base unit (21) to position the camera for image capture. When another user wishes to take the floor, the MY TURN button is pressed on another personal locator (their own personal locator) and their stored field of view command packet is transmitted to the base unit to position the camera for another image capture. Parker et al. does not expressly teach of the generation of two sets of commands (the act of adjusting the field of view variables on each individual personal locator) for two sets of tasks during overlapping time intervals, however, Parker et al. teaches (1<sup>st</sup> embodiment) of a system with two personal locators, that can be expanded to a plurality of personal locators. It would have been obvious that a system with two or more personal locators, actively being used, generating packaged commands, to control one camera would do so during overlapping time intervals. Increasing the number of personal locators, in the system, would obviously increase the likelihood of command generation during

Art Unit: 2612

overlapping time intervals of a first and second sets of commands. Parker et al. teaches that once the command sets are generated in the personal locators they are then transmitted from each personal locator by pressing the MY TURN button on each keypad, albeit, it is noted that in the second embodiment of the invention, as stated in column 7 (lines 10 – 27), Parker et al. teaches of a *master/slave* combination in which a personal locator is chosen as the *master* and the rest are designated *slaves*. The *master* personal locator then has the ability to *lockout* the *slaves* until transmission of its command package is complete. Once the *master* transmission is complete, the *slaves* may transmit in a pre-designated priority order, therefore, allowing (preventing) one (multiple) transmission at a time. As shown in figure 2 and as stated in column 5 (lines 35 – 43), the micro-controller circuitry (12) of each personal locator contains a microprocessor with internal RAM and ROM and is specifically responsible for user programming, real-time user input, command generation/reception, and program execution (as required for claims 6, 10, and 14).

8. As for claim 2, Parker et al. discloses, as stated in column 7 (lines 35 – 41), the act of transmitting the first set of commands includes packaging the first set of commands together to form a command packet.

9. As for claims 3, 9, and 11, Parker et al. discloses, as shown in figure 3, an imaging device that is a camera (23).

10. As for claims 4, 7, 12, 13, and 15, Parker et al. discloses, as stated in column 6 (lines 30 – 59), one of the first and second tasks comprises setup of the imaging device to capture a video image and capture of the video image.

Art Unit: 2612

11. As for claims 5, 8, and 16, Parker et al. discloses, as stated in column 6 (lines 30 – 59), one of the first and second tasks comprises setup of the imaging device to capture a video image and capture of the video image, although, does not explicitly disclose one of the first and second tasks comprises setup of the imaging device to capture a still image and capture of the still image. However, Parker et al. teaches, as stated in column 8 (lines 57 – 59), that the camera may be of CCD type (digital). It is inherent that a video image in digital cameras are a continuous series of still images, therefore, the setup of video and still image capture and video and still image capture are identical and can be used interchangeably.

12. Claims 19 – 21, 24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker et al.

13. As for claims 19, 24, and 28, Parker et al. discloses, as shown in figures 1 and 3 and as stated in columns 6 (lines 30 – 59) and 7 (lines 35 – 41), the packaging comprising: accumulating the first set of commands as the commands for the first set are being generated; and accumulating the second set of commands concurrently with the accumulation of the first set of commands as the commands for the second set are being generated. Parker teaches a system in which a plurality of personal locators (11) are programmed, by onboard keypad (19), with the bus address of the selected camera. The selected camera's field of view variables, PAN, TILT, ZOOM, FOCUS, IRIS, etc. are adjusted from each individual personal locator using button switches (37 – 44) on the keypad. The commands associated with adjusting the selected camera's field of view are generated, are packaged, and are stored in each individual personal locator by the routine as shown in flowchart 2 (figure 7). When a particular user wants to display their stored field of view command packet, the MY TURN button (41) on the keypad of

Art Unit: 2612

their personal locator is pressed and the command packet is transmitted to the camera base unit (21) to position the camera for image capture. When another user wishes to take the floor, the MY TURN button is pressed on another personal locator (their own personal locator) and their stored field of view command packet is transmitted to the base unit to position the camera for another image capture. Parker et al. does not expressly teach of the generation (accumulation) of two sets of commands (the act of adjusting the field of view variables on each individual personal locator) for two sets of commands concurrently, however, Parker et al. teaches (1<sup>st</sup> embodiment) of a system with two personal locators, that can be expanded to a plurality of personal locators. It would have been obvious that a system with two or more personal locators, actively being used, generating packaged commands, to control one camera would do so concurrently. Increasing the number of personal locators, in the system, would obviously increase the likelihood of command generation concurrently of a first and second set of commands.

14. As for claim 20, Parker et al. discloses, as shown in figure 2 and as stated in column 5 (lines 35 – 43), the micro-controller circuitry (12) of each personal locator contains a microprocessor with internal RAM and ROM and is specifically responsible for user programming, real-time user input, command generation/reception, and program execution. Therefore, it is inherent that one of the acts of accumulating the first and second sets of commands comprises executing an application program.

15. As for claim 21, Parker et al. discloses, as shown in figure 2 and as stated in column 5 (lines 35 – 43), the micro-controller circuitry (12) of each personal locator contains a microprocessor with internal RAM and ROM and is specifically responsible for user



Art Unit: 2612

programming, real-time user input, command generation/reception, and program execution.

Therefore, it is inherent that one of the acts of accumulating the first and second sets of commands comprises executing a driver program.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

17. Claims 17 – 18, 22 – 23, and 25 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parker et al.

18. As for claims 17, 22, and 25, Parker et al. discloses, as shown in figures 1 and 3 and as stated in columns 6 (lines 30 – 59) and 7 (lines 10 – 27, lines 35 – 41), a method comprising: setting up and capturing a first frame, including transmitting a first set of commands; setting up and capturing a second frame, including transmitting a second set of commands; and preventing the transmission of the first set of commands from being interleaved with the transmission of the second set of commands. Parker teaches a system in which a plurality of personal locators (11) are programmed, by onboard keypad (19), with the bus address of the selected camera. The selected camera's field of view variables, PAN, TILT, ZOOM, FOCUS, IRIS, etc. are adjusted from each individual personal locator using button switches (37 – 44) on the keypad. The commands associated with adjusting the selected camera's field of view are generated, are

Art Unit: 2612

packaged, and are stored in each individual personal locator by the routine as shown in flowchart 2 (figure 7). When a particular user wants to display their stored field of view command packet, the MY TURN button (41) on the keypad of their personal locator is pressed and the command packet is transmitted to the camera base unit (21) to position the camera for image capture [first frame]. When another user wishes to take the floor, the MY TURN button is pressed on another personal locator (their own personal locator) and their stored field of view command packet is transmitted to the base unit to position the camera for another image capture [second frame]. Therefore, Parker et al. teaches the setting up, capture, and transmission of first and second frames. Parker et al. also teaches of a *master/slave* combination in which a personal locator is chosen as the *master* and the rest are designated *slaves*. The *master* personal locator then has the ability to *lockout* the *slaves* until transmission of its command package is complete. Once the *master* transmission is complete, the *slaves* may transmit in a pre-designated priority order, therefore, allowing (preventing) one (multiple) transmission at a time. As shown in figure 2 and as stated in column 5 (lines 35 – 43), the micro-controller circuitry (12) of each personal locator contains a microprocessor with internal RAM and ROM and is specifically responsible for user programming, real-time user input, command generation/reception, and program execution (as required for claims 6, 10, and 14).

19. As for claims 18, 23, and 27, Parker et al. discloses, as stated in column 7 (lines 35 – 41), the act of preventing interleaving includes packaging one of the first and second sets of commands together to form a command packet.

20. As for claim 26, Parker et al. discloses, as shown in figure 3, an imaging device that is a camera (23).


Art Unit: 2612

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin P Misleh whose telephone number is 703.305.8090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy R Garber can be reached on 703.305.4929. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703.872.9314 for regular communications and 703.872.9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703.306.0377.

JPM  
December 13, 2002

  
WENDY R. GARBER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600